arXiv:1606.08944v1 [math.NT] 29 Jun 2016

ON THE INDEX CONJECTURE IN ZERO-SUM THEORY: SINGULAR CASE

FAN GE

ABSTRACT. Let $S = (a_1) \cdots (a_k)$ be a minimal zero-sum sequence over a finite cyclic group G. The index conjecture states that if $k = 4$ and $\gcd(|G|, 6) = 1$, then S has index 1. In this paper we prove that if S is singular then the index of S is 1.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper let G be a finite cyclic group of order n, written additively. By a *sequence S of length k over G* we mean a sequence with k elements, each of which is in G. We write $(a_1) \cdots (a_k)$ for such a sequence, rather than $a_1, \ldots, a_k$. A sequence S is said to be a *zero-sum* sequence if $\sum_i a_i = 0$. It is a *minimal* zero-sum sequence if it is a zero-sum sequence but no proper nontrivial subsequence of it is. Given any g a generator of G, we can write $S = (x_1 g) \cdots (x_k g)$ for some natural numbers $x_1, \ldots, x_k$, where by $x_i g$ we mean the sum $g + g + \cdots + g$ with x_i terms. We also require the following definition.

Definition 1.1. For a sequence over G

$$S = (x_1 g) \cdots (x_k g), \qquad \text{where } 1 \leq x_1, ..., x_k \leq n\,,$$

define the g-norm of S to be $\|S\|_g = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_i}{n}$. The *index* of S is defined by

$$\text{ind}(S) = \min \|S\|_g,$$

where the minimum is taken over all generators g of G.

The index of a sequence is a crucial invariant in the theory of zero-sum sequences over cyclic groups. It was introduced by Kleitman and Lemke [6] and

This work was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1200582.

then became an important tool in the study of zero-sum sequences and related topics (see, for example, Geroldinger [4] and Gao [2]). An important question is to determine the pairs (k, n) for which every minimal zero-sum sequence S of length k over G has index 1. The cases $k \neq 4$ or $\gcd(n, 6) \neq 1$ have been settled (see [5], [9], [10], [15]). Hence, the only remaining case is when $k = 4$ and, at the same time, $\gcd(n, 6) = 1$. The following conjecture is widely held.

Conjecture 1. *Let G be a finite cyclic group such that $\gcd(|G|, 6) = 1$. Then every minimal zero-sum sequence S over G of length 4 has* ind*(S)* = 1.

Remark 1. One can show that, for a minimal zero-sum sequence S of length 4 over G, we have either $\mathrm{ind}(S) = 1$ or $\mathrm{ind}(S) = 2$, and moreover, $\mathrm{ind}(S) = 2$ if and only if $\|S\|_g = 2$ for all generators g of G. This is because for such S we have by definition that $\|S\|_g$ is equal to 1, 2, or 3; but if $\|S\|_g = 3$ for some generator g, then it is easy to see that $\|S\|_{-g} = 1$, where $-g$ is also a generator.

Below we always assume that $(n, 6) = 1$.

In [8], Y. Li et al. proved that Conjecture 1 is true for when n is a prime power. Later it was proved for the case when n has two distinct prime factors (see [7] and [14]). In [3] we proved the following result.

Theorem. *Suppose that n is the smallest integer for which Conjecture 1 fails. Let $S = (x_1)(x_2)(x_3)(x_4)$ be a minimal zero-sum sequence over $G \cong \mathbb{Z}/n$ with* ind$(S) = 2$. *Then we have $\gcd(n, x_i) = 1$ for all i.*

In view of the above theorem, we see that to prove Conjecture 1 it suffices to prove that if $S = (x_1)(x_2)(x_3)(x_4)$ is a minimal zero-sum sequence with $(n, x_i) = 1$ for all i, then $\mathrm{ind}(S) = 1$.

The purpose of this paper is to give a proof of Conjecture 1 in the case when S is singular (see below).

Definition 1.2. Let $S = (x_1) \cdots (x_k)$ be a minimal zero-sum sequence over $\mathbb{Z}/n$ with $1 \leq x_1, ..., x_k < n$ and $(n, 6) = 1$. Then S is called *singular* if the following conditions hold:

(i) $x_1 = 1$;
(ii) $x_2 + 1 = x_3$ or $x_2 = n - 2$;
(iii) $(x_i, n) = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, 4$.

Theorem 1. *The index of S is 1 if S is singular.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this section we always assume that $S = (x_1) \cdots (x_k)$ is a minimal zero-sum sequence over $\mathbb{Z}/n$ with $1 \le x_1, ..., x_k < n$.

For integers x and $y > 0$, let $(x)_y$ denote the least nonnegative residue of x mod y. For $z \in \mathbb{Z}/y$, we may view z as an integer and define $(z)_y$ similarly.

Lemma 2. *Let $S = (x_1)(x_2)(x_3)(x_4)$. Given any generator g in G, write $S = (y_1 g)(y_2 g)(y_3 g)(y_4 g)$ for $1 \le y_i < n$. Then we have $y_i = (g^{-1} x_i)_n$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$, where g^{-1} is the inverse of g in the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Z}/n)^*$. In particular, we have*

$$n \, \|S\|_{g^{-1}} \; = \; \sum_{i=1}^{4} (g x_i)_n \; .$$

Proof. For any $i = 1, ..., 4$, we have $x_i = y_i g$ in G. Hence $x_i g^{-1} = y_i$ in G. Therefore, $y_i = (g^{-1} x_i)_n$. □

The following lemma will be used frequently.

Lemma 3. *If S has index 2, then*
(i) For any $g \in (\mathbb{Z}/n)^*$ we have $\#\{i : (x_i g)_n > \frac{n}{2}\} = 2$.
(ii) If in addition $(x_i, n) = 1$ for all i, then the x_i's are pairwise distinct.

Proof. The first part is essentially Remark 2.1 of [7]. For the second part, suppose $x_i = x_j$ for some $i \neq j$. By Remark 1 and Lemma 2 we have

$$2n = n \, \|S\|_{x_i} \; = \sum_{u=1}^{4} (x_i^{-1} x_u)_n = 1 + 1 + \sum_{u \neq i,j} (x_i^{-1} x_u)_n .$$

Since S is minimal, we clearly have $(x_i^{-1}x_u)_n \leq n-2$. Thus, the right-hand side of the above is at most $1+1+(n-2)+(n-2) = 2n-2$, a contradiction. $\square$

To state our next result, we make the following definition.

Definition 2.1. We call an integer k *good* if k satisfies the following conditions:
(i) $k = 2^l$, where l is a nonnegative integer;
(ii) $k < \frac{n}{6}$;
(iii) $F(k) := \Big(2n-2-2\big[\frac{3k-1}{3k}\,n\big]\Big)\,k > \frac{n-1}{2}$, where $[\cdot]$ is the lower floor function.

Proposition 4. *Let $S = (x_1)(x_2)(x_3)(x_4)$. Suppose that S has index 2, and that $x_1 = 1$, $x_2 + 1 = x_3$ and $(x_i, n) = 1$ for all i. If k is good, then $x_2 \geq [\frac{6k-1}{6k}n]$.*

We need the following three lemmas in order to prove Proposition 4.

Lemma 5. *Under the assumption of Proposition 4, we have $x_4 < x_2$.*

Proof. Since $x_1 + x_4 = 1 + x_4 < n$ we see that $2x_2 + 1 = x_2 + x_3 \geq n+1$. It follows that $x_2 \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$. By part (i) of Lemma 3 we have $\#\{i : x_i > \frac{n}{2}\} = 2$. Therefore, as $x_3 > x_2 > n/2$, we must have $x_4 < n/2$. Hence $x_4 < x_2$. $\square$

Lemma 6. *If $k \geq 2$ is good, then $k/2$ is good.*

Proof. It suffices to check the third condition. Namely, we need to show that

$$F\Big(\frac{k}{2}\Big) > \frac{n-1}{2}.$$

Since k is good, we have

$$F(k) > \frac{n-1}{2}.$$

Therefore it suffices to prove that $F(k/2) > F(k)$. Writing

$$f(k) = \Big[\frac{3k-1}{3k}\,n\Big], \tag{1}$$

then by a straightforward computation, we see that to prove $F(k/2) > F(k)$ it suffices to show that

$$2f(k) - f(k/2) \geq n-1.$$

Notice that the left-hand side is an integer. Thus, the above inequality is equivalent to

$$2f(k) - f(k/2) > n-2,$$

or,

$$2\Big(\frac{3k-1}{3k}n-\Big\{\frac{3k-1}{3k}\Big\}\Big)-\Big(\frac{3k/2-1}{3k/2}n-\Big\{\frac{3k/2-1}{3k/2}\Big\}\Big)>n-2.$$

A straightforward computation turns it into

$$2-2\Big\{\frac{3k-1}{3k}\Big\}+\Big\{\frac{3k/2-1}{3k/2}\Big\}>0.$$

But this is clearly true. Hence the lemma follows. □

Lemma 7. *Let $f(k)$ be defined as in* (1)*. Under the assumption of Proposition 4, if k is good and $x_2 \geq f(k)$, then $x_2 \geq f(2k)$.*

Proof. First we claim that $x_2 \neq f(k)$. Suppose $x_2 = f(k)$. We will show that

$$\#\Big\{i : (x_i k)_n > \frac{n}{2}\Big\} \neq 2.$$

Then by Lemma 3 S would have index 1, a contradiction. To prove the above inequality, first notice that $x_1 k = k$. Thus $(x_1 k)_n = k$. Next,

$$x_2 k = f(k)k = \Big[\frac{3k-1}{3k}n\Big]k \in \Big(\Big(\frac{3k-1}{3k}n-1\Big)k, \frac{3k-1}{3k}nk\Big),$$

and

$$\Big(\frac{3k-1}{3k}n-1\Big)k-(k-1)n = 2n/3-k > 0$$

since k is good implies $k < n/6$. Hence, $x_2 k \in ((k-1)n, kn)$, and this gives

$$\begin{aligned}(x_2 k)_n = x_2 k-(k-1)n &> \Big(\frac{3k-1}{3k}n-1\Big)k-(k-1)n = 2n/3-k \\ &> 2n/3-n/6 = n/2.\end{aligned}$$

Also, since $x_3 = x_2 + 1$, we have $x_3 k \in (x_2 k, kn) \subseteq ((k-1)n, kn)$. Thus,

$$(x_3 k)_n = x_3 k-(k-1)n > x_2 k-(k-1)n = (x_2 k)_n > n/2.$$

Next, since $x_4 = 2n - x_1 - x_2 - x_3 = 2n - 2 - 2x_2 = 2n - 2 - 2f(k)$, and since k is good implies that $(2n-2-2f(k))k > \frac{n-1}{2}$, we see that $x_4 k > \frac{n-1}{2}$. It follows that $x_4 k \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$ since $x_4 k$ is an integer. On the other hand,

$$x_4 k = (2n-2-2f(k))k < \Big(2n-2-2\Big(\frac{3k-1}{3k}n-1\Big)\Big)k = 2n/3.$$

Therefore, we see that $(x_4 k)_n = x_4 k > n/2$. This gives

$$\#\Big\{i : (x_i k)_n > \frac{n}{2}\Big\} = 3,$$

and the claim follows.

Thus, we have $x_2 \geq f(k)+1$. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} x_2 3k &\in ((f(k)+1)3k, 3kn) \\ &= \Big(\Big(\Big[\frac{3k-1}{3k} n \Big] + 1 \Big) 3k, 3kn \Big) \\ &\subseteq \Big(\frac{3k-1}{3k} n \cdot 3k, 3kn \Big) \\ &= ((3k-1)n, 3kn). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $(x_2 3k)_n = x_2 3k - (3k-1)n$. We also clearly have

$$x_3 3k \in (x_2 3k, 3kn) \subseteq ((3k-1)n, 3kn).$$

Hence, $(x_3 3k)_n = x_3 3k - (3k-1)n$. Recall that $k < n/6$, thus $(x_1 3k)_n = 3k$. Now since S has index 2 and since $\gcd(3k, n) = 1$, by Remark 1 and Lemma 2 we see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4} (x_i 3k)_n = 2n.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 2n &= 3k + x_2 3k - (3k-1)n + x_3 3k - (3k-1)n + (x_4 3k)_n \\ &= 3k(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4) - (6k-2)n + (x_4 3k)_n - x_4 3k \\ &= 3k \cdot 2n - (6k-2)n + (x_4 3k)_n - x_4 3k \\ &= 2n + (x_4 3k)_n - x_4 3k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have $x_4 3k = (x_4 3k)_n < n$, or $x_4 < n/3k$. Using the relation $x_4 = 2n - 2 - 2x_2$, we obtain

$$x_2 > n - 1 - \frac{n}{6k}.$$

But since $\frac{n}{6k}$ is not an integer, we conclude that $x_2 \geq [n - n/6k] = f(2k)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 4: First we show that $x_2 \geq f(1)$. By Lemma 5 we have $x_4 < x_2$. But $x_4 = 2n-2-2x_2$. It follows that $2n-2-2x_2 < x_2$, or $x_2 > \frac{2n-2}{3}$. When $n \equiv 1 \pmod 3$, say $n = 3m+1$, we have $x_2 > \frac{2n-2}{3} = 2m = [2n/3] = f(1)$. When $n \equiv 2 \pmod 3$, say $n = 3m+2$, we have

$$x_2 > \frac{2n-2}{3} = 2m + \frac{2}{3}.$$

This implies $x_2 \geq 2m+1$ since x_2 is an integer. But $2m+1 = [2n/3] = f(1)$. Thus, in both cases we have $x_2 \geq f(1)$.

Write $k = 2^l$. Since k is good, by Lemma 6 we have 2^t is good for any integer $t \in [0, l]$. In particular, $2^0 = 1$ is good. This together with the fact that $x_2 \geq f(1)$ implies $x_2 \geq f(2)$ by Lemma 7. Now since $x_2 \geq f(2)$ and since 2^t is good for any integer $t \in [0, l]$, we can use Lemma 7 repeatedly to conclude that $x_2 \geq f(2 \cdot 2^l) = f(2k)$. □

Lemma 8. *Let $b \geq 3$ be an integer such that*

$$3 \cdot 2^b < n < 3 \cdot 2^{b+1}.$$

Then $k = 2^{b-2}$ is good.

Proof. Clearly $k = 2^{b-2}$ satisfies the first two conditions in the definition of good. It remains to prove that

$$\Big(2n - 2 - 2\big[\frac{3k-1}{3k}\, n\big]\Big)\, k > \frac{n-1}{2}.$$

It suffices to show that

$$\Big(2n - 2 - 2\Big(\frac{3k-1}{3k}\, n\Big)\Big)\, k > \frac{n-1}{2}.$$

A straightforward computation shows that this is equivalent to

$$2k < \frac{n}{6} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

But this is clear since

$$2k = 2^{b-1} = \frac{3 \cdot 2^b}{6} < \frac{n}{6}.$$

□

Proposition 9. *Let $S = (x_1)(x_2)(x_3)(x_4)$. Suppose that S has index 2, and that $x_1 = 1$, $x_2 + 1 = x_3$ and $(x_i, n) = 1$ for all i. Then $x_2 = n-4$ or $n-3$. Therefore,*

$$S = (1)(n-4)(n-3)(6) \quad \textit{or} \quad (1)(n-3)(n-2)(4).$$

Proof. Let $3 \cdot 2^b < n < 3 \cdot 2^{b+1}$. By Proposition 4, we have $x_2 \geq f(2k)$ if k is good. By Lemma 8, $k = 2^{b-2}$ is good. It follows that

$$x_2 \geq f(2^{b-1}) = \Big[\frac{3 \cdot 2^{b-1} - 1}{3 \cdot 2^{b-1}} n\Big].$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} n - x_2 &< n - \frac{3 \cdot 2^{b-1} - 1}{3 \cdot 2^{b-1}} n + 1 \\ &< 5. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $n - x_2 \leq 4$, and x_2 could be $n-4$, $n-3$ or $n-2$. The case $x_2 = n-2$ can be excluded because $n - 2 \geq x_3 = x_2 + 1 > x_2$. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we prove Theorem 1. We need the following result.

Theorem 10. *The sequences* $(1)(n-4)(n-3)(6)$ *and* $(1)(n-3)(n-2)(4)$ *have index* 1.

Proof. If $n \leq 1000$, it is known that every length four minimal zero-sum sequence over $\mathbb{Z}/n$ has index 1 (see [9]). Thus, we may assume $n > 1000$. Moreover, it is known that S has index 1 if n has at most two distinct prime factors (see [8], [7] and [14]). Hence we may also assume that n has at least three distinct prime factors.

First, let us consider $S = (1)(n-4)(n-3)(6)$. We claim that there exists a $g \in (\mathbb{Z}/n)^*$ such that $n/12 < g < n/8$. This is clearly true for n "large enough" in view of the Prime Number Theorem for arithmetic progressions. But here we would like to avoid determining the effective lower bound for "large" n. Therefore, instead of the Prime Number Theorem, we use the following result.

Lemma 11. (See [1].)
(i) *The interval* $(2N, 3N)$ *contains a prime for any integer* $N \geq 2$.
(ii) *The interval* $\left[N+1, \frac{3(N+1)}{2}\right)$ *contains a prime for any integer* $N \geq 2$.

If there is a prime p in the interval $(n/12, n/8)$, then we will be done if we can show that p is coprime to n. Indeed, if p divides n, then we would have n/p is an integer less than 12, and thus n takes the form $5p$, $7p$ or $11p$, which contradicts our assumption that n has at least three distinct prime factors.

Now suppose there is no prime in the interval $(n/12, n/8)$. Then in this case we can show that $[n/12]$ is a prime. Indeed, taking $N = [n/24]$ in part (i) of the above lemma, we see that the interval $(2[n/24], 3[n/24])$ contains a prime. It follows that

$([n/12]-1, n/8)$ contains a prime since $2[n/24] \geq [n/12]-1$ and $3[n/24] \leq n/8$. Thus, if $(n/12, n/8)$ contains no prime then $[n/12]$ must be prime.

Let $[n/12] = q$. Since q is prime and $n > 1000$ we see that q is odd. In part (ii) of the above lemma take $N = q$, and it follows that $[q+1, 3(q+1)/2)$ contains a prime. Since q is odd, $3(q+1)/2$ is an integer. Thus, we obtain that the interval

$$\Big[q+1, \frac{3(q+1)}{2} - 1\Big]$$

contains a prime. Note that $q + 1 = [n/12] + 1 > n/12$. Therefore, using the fact that $[q+1, 3(q+1)/2 - 1]$ contains a prime and the assumption that $(n/12, n/8)$ contains no prime, we conclude that

$$\frac{3(q+1)}{2} - 1 \geq \frac{n}{8}.$$

This in turn gives $12q + 4 \geq n$. Recall that $q = [n/12]$ and $\gcd(n, 6) = 1$. Hence we have

$$n = 12q + 1.$$

Moreover, it is straightforward to compute that

$$\frac{3(q+1)}{2} - 2 - \frac{n}{8} = -\frac{5}{8}.$$

Thus we have $[q+1, 3(q+1)/2-2] \subseteq (n/12, n/8)$. It follows that $3(q+1)/2-1$ is a prime.

Write $q = 2z + 1$. Then since $3z + 2 = 3(q+1)/2 - 1$ is prime we see that z is odd. By part (ii) of the above lemma, we know that $\big[z+1, \frac{3(z+1)}{2}\big)$ contains a prime. Hence

$$\Big[z+1, \frac{3(z+1)}{2} - 1\Big]$$

contains a prime p since $3(z+1)/2$ is an integer. We easily check that

$$z + 1 > \frac{24z + 13}{24} = \frac{n}{24}$$

and that

$$\frac{3(z+1)}{2} - 1 < \frac{24z + 13}{16} = \frac{n}{16}.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$p \in \Big(\frac{n}{24}, \frac{n}{16}\Big).$$

This gives

$$2p \in \Big(\frac{n}{12}, \frac{n}{8}\Big).$$

To prove our claim, it remains to show that $\gcd(2p, n) = 1$. If not, then p divides n. But this implies that n/p is an integer smaller than 24, and thus n takes the form $5p, 7p, 11p, 13p, 17p, 19p$ or $23p$, which contradicts our assumption that n has at least three distinct prime factors. Therefore, our claim follows.

We have shown that there exists a $g \in (\mathbb{Z}/n)^*$ with $n/12 < g < n/8$. A straightforward computation then shows that $(1 \cdot g)_n < n/2$, $((n-4) \cdot g)_n > n/2$, $((n-3) \cdot g)_n > n/2$ and that $(6 \cdot g)_n > n/2$. Thus, we have

$$\#\Big\{i : (x_i g)_n > \frac{n}{2}\Big\} = 3,$$

where $x_1 = 1$, $x_2 = n-4$, $x_3 = n-3$ and $x_4 = 6$. It follows from Lemma 3 that S has index 1.

The proof for the case when $S = (1)(n-3)(n-2)(4)$ is almost exactly the same, and we omit it. □

Proof of Theorem 1: If $x_3 = x_2 + 1$ and S has index 2, then by Proposition 9

$$S = (1)(n-4)(n-3)(6) \quad \textit{or} \quad (1)(n-3)(n-2)(4).$$

But it follows from Theorem 10 that these S both have index 1, a contradiction. Thus, if $x_3 = x_2 + 1$ then S has index 1.

Now suppose $x_2 = n-2$ and S has index 2. Then $2n = 1 + (n-2) + x_3 + x_4$ implies that $(x_3^{-1}x_4)_n = (x_3^{-1} - 1)_n$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S &= (1)(x_2)(x_3)(x_4) \\ &= (x_3^{-1}x_3)(x_3^{-1}x_2x_3)(x_3)(x_3^{-1}x_4x_3) \\ &= \Big((x_3^{-1})_n x_3\Big)\Big((x_3^{-1}x_2)_n x_3\Big)\Big((1)_n x_3\Big)\Big((x_3^{-1}x_4)_n x_3\Big) \\ &= \Big((x_3^{-1})_n x_3\Big)\Big((x_3^{-1}x_2)_n x_3\Big)\Big((1)_n x_3\Big)\Big((x_3^{-1} - 1)_n x_3\Big) \\ &=: (y_3x_3)(y_4x_3)(y_1x_3)(y_2x_3), \end{aligned}$$

where $y_1 = 1 = (1)_n$, $y_2 = (x_3^{-1} - 1)_n$, $y_3 = (x_3^{-1})_n$ and $y_4 = (x_3^{-1}x_2)_n$. Let Y be the sequence $(y_1)(y_2)(y_3)(y_4)$. It is clear that Y is singular, and that $y_2 + 1 = y_3$. Therefore, it follows from the last paragraph that Y has index 1. It is then clear that S also has index 1. This completes the proof. □

REFERENCES

[1] M. El Bachraoui, *Primes in the Interval [2n, 3n]*, Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sci., Vol. 1, 2006, no. 13, 617-621.

[2] W. D. Gao, *Zero sums in finite cyclic groups*, Integers 0 (2000), Paper A14, 9p.

[3] F. Ge, *Note on the index conjecture in zero-sum theory and its connection to a Dedekind-type sum*, Journal of Number Theory 168 (2016), 128-134.

[4] A. Geroldinger, *On non-unique factorizations into irreducible elements. II*, Number Theory, Vol II Budapest 1987, Colloquia Mathematica Societatis Janos Bolyai, vol. 51, North Holland, 1990, 723-757.

[5] A. Geroldinger, *Additive group theory and non-unique factorizations*, Combinatorial Number Theory and Additive Group Theory (A. Geroldinger and I. Ruzsa, eds.), Advanced Courses in Mathematics CRM Overlinecelona, Birkhäuser, 2009, pp. 1 ÍC 86.

[6] D. Kleitman and P. Lemke, *An addition theorem on the integers modulo n*, J. Number Theory 31(1989), 335-345.

[7] Y. Li and J. Peng, *Minimal zero-sum sequences of length four over finite cyclic groups II*, International Journal of Number Theory 9 (2013), 845-866.

[8] Y. Li, C. Plyley, P. Yuan, and X. Zeng, *Minimal zero-sum sequences of length four over finite cyclic groups*, J. Number Theory, 130 (2010) 2033-2048.

[9] V. Ponomarenko, *Minimal zero sequences of finite cyclic groups*, Integers 4(2004), Paper A24, 6p.

[10] S. Savchen and F. Chen, *Long zero-free sequences in finite cyclic groups*, Discrete Math. 307(2007), 2671-2679.

[11] C. Shen and L. Xia, *On the index-conjecture of length four minimal zero-sum sequences II*, International Journal of Number Theory: 2014, 10(3), 601-622.

[12] C. Shen, L. Xia and Y. Li, *On the index of length four minimal zero-sum sequences*, Colloquium Mathematicum: 2014, 135(2), 201-209.

[13] L. Xia, *On the index-conjecture on length four minimal zero-sum sequences*, International Journal of Number Theory: 2013, 9(6), 1505-1528.

[14] L. Xia and C. Shen, *Minimal zero-sum sequences of length four over cyclic group with order* $n = p^{\alpha}q^{\beta}$, Journal of Number Theory 133 (2013) pp. 4047-4068.

[15] P. Yuan, *On the index of minimal zero-sum sequences over finite cyclic groups*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A114(2007), 1545-1551.

E-mail address: fan.ge@rochester.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER, ROCHESTER, NY, UNITED STATES